

DIVISORIAL CONTRACTIONS TO SOME GORENSTEIN SINGULARITIES

I. YU. FEDOROV

ABSTRACT. Divisorial contractions to singularities, defined by equations $xy + z^n + u^n = 0$ $n \geq 3$ and $xy + z^3 + u^4 = 0$ are classified.

The problem of birational classification of algebraic varieties is highly interconnected with the problem of description of singularities on them. One of the most important class of three-dimensional singularities is terminal singularities, which arise within minimal models program. Despite the analytical classification of the singularities [4],[17],[15],[13], this description does not help one to fully understand many birational properties of them. In particular, the problem of description of resolution of such singularities and the problem of classification of morphisms of terminal varieties are still up-to-date. Divisorial contractions to cyclic quotient singularities were described by Y.Kawamata [6], S.Mori [14] and S. Cutkosky [3] classified contractions from terminal Gorenstein threefolds. T.Luo [12] set out contractions when the index is not increase. A.Corti [1] with M.Mella [2] described divisorial contractions to $xy + z^n + u^n = 0$ points, where $n = 2, 3$. Recently M.Kawakita [8], [9], [10] has gave a description of contractions to a smooth and cA points. In this paper we classify divisorial contractions from a terminal 3-folds to a germ of a point defined by the equation $xy + z^n + u^n = 0$, where $n \geq 3$ and to a germ of a singularity defined by the equation $xy + z^3 + u^4 = 0$ using quite different method then the one introduced in [10]. Our method allow us to deal with all terminal Gorenstein singularities and with non Gorenstein of a type cA/m .

The author would like to thank Professor V.A. Iskovskikh and Professor Yu.G. Prokhorov for their vulnerable discussions and encouragement. The author was partially supported by grants RFBR-99-01-01132, RFBR-96-15-96146 and INTAS-OPEN-97-2072.

1. Preliminary results

We will deal with varieties over $\mathbb{C}$. The basic results and notions are contained in [7], [18].

Definition 1.1. Consider a cyclic quotient singularity $X := \mathbb{C}^n / \mathbb{Z}_m(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, where $a_i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 1$ (the case $m = 1$, i. e. $X \simeq \mathbb{C}^n$, is also possible). Let $x_1, \dots, x_n$ be eigen-coordinates in $\mathbb{C}^n$, for $\mathbb{Z}_m$. The *weighted blow-up* of X with weights $a_1, \dots, a_n$ is a projective birational morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ such that Y is covered by affine charts $U_1, \dots, U_n$, where

$$U_i = \mathbb{C}_{y_1, \dots, y_n}^n / \mathbb{Z}_{a_i}(-a_1, \dots, \overset{\uparrow}{m}, \dots, -a_n).$$

i

The coordinates in X and in U_i are related by

$$x_i = y_i^{a_i/m}, \quad x_j = y_j y_i^{a_j/m}, \quad j \neq i.$$

The exceptional set E of f is an irreducible divisor and $E \cap U_i = \{y_i = 0\} / \mathbb{Z}_{a_i}$. The morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is toric, i.e. there is an equivariant natural action of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$. It is easy to show that E is the weighted projective space $\mathbb{P}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $\mathcal{O}_E(bE) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(-mb)$, if b is divisible by $\text{lcm}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ (and then bE is a Cartier divisor).

Note that the blow-up constructed above depends on a choice of numbers $a_1, \dots, a_n$, and not just on their values mod m .

Let X be a hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^n$. By *weighted blow-up* of X with weights $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ we will mean the restriction of the weighted blow-up of $\mathbb{C}^n$ with weights $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ on X .

2. Contractions to $xy + z^n + u^n = 0$

In this section we will prove the theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a divisorial contraction from from terminal 3-fold Y to X – a germ of $xy + z^n + u^n = 0$, $n \geq 3$ singularity, $\rho(Y/X) = 1$, divisor S is f -exceptional. Then f is isomorphic to the weighted blow-up of X with weights $(k, n - k, 1, 1)$ for some integer $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$.*

The classification we will obtain using the following plan: Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a divisorial contraction from from terminal 3-fold Y to a germ of $xy + z^n + u^n = 0$, $n \geq 3$ singularity X , such that f -exceptional divisor S is an irreducible reduced divisor. Let $f_1: Y_1 \rightarrow X$ be the weighted blow-up with weights $(1, n - 1, 1, 1)$. It follows from [5] that the discrepancy of the f_1 -exceptional divisor E_1 is equal to 1.

In fact, E_1 is a rational surface with just one singularity of $\frac{1}{n-1}(1, 1)$ type, $\rho(S)$ is equal to n , the configuration of (-1) -curves $\bar{l}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ on the minimal resolution of $\bar{E}_1 \rightarrow E_1$ is as on the Fig. 1.

We will deal with following cases:

1. The discrepancy of $a(S)$ (over X) is equal to 1. All those morphisms (in Mori's category) is classified in [5].
2. $a(S) = k \geq 2$.
 - (a) The center of S on E_1 is a point and it does not lie on any l_i .
 - (b) The center of S on E_1 is a curve and it does not coincide with any l_i .
 - (c) The center of S on E_1 is a point and it lies on some l_i .
 - (d) The center of S on E_1 is a curve and it coincides with some l_i .

We will prove our main theorem checking all the cases.

2.2. Geometry of E_1 .

Proposition 2.3. *For the surface E_1 the following statements are true:*

1. E_1 is a rational surface with one singularity of $\frac{1}{n-1}(1, 1)$ type;
2. the Picard number of E_1 is equal to n ;
3. the configuration of (-1) -curves $\bar{l}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ on the minimal resolution of E_1 $\alpha : \bar{E}_1 \rightarrow E_1$ is as on the Fig. 1.

Proof. 1. We have Y_1 covered by four affine charts U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4 :

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 &= \{\bar{y} + \bar{z}^n + \bar{u}^n = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^4, \\ U_2 &= \{\bar{x} + \bar{z}^n + \bar{u}^n = 0\} / \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}(-1, 1, -1, -1), \\ U_3 &= \{\bar{x}\bar{y} + 1 + \bar{u}^n = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^4, \\ U_4 &= \{\bar{x}\bar{y} + \bar{z}^n + 1 = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^4. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, there is only one singularity of $\frac{1}{n-1}(-1, 1, 1)$ type on Y_1 . It lies in chart U_2 .

2. We have $K_{E_1}^2 = \frac{(n-n+2)^2 n}{n-1} = \frac{4n}{n-1}$. The minimal resolution of E_1 is just one blow-up, and the exceptional curve will be $-(n-1)$ -curve with discrepancy $\frac{3-n}{n-1}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\bar{E}_1}^2 &= K_{E_1}^2 + \left(\frac{3-n}{n-1} \right) (-2 + n - 1) = \frac{4n}{n-1} - \\ &\quad - \frac{9 + n^2 - 6n}{n-1} = \frac{10n - 9 - n^2}{n-1} = 9 - n \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the Noether formulae that $\chi(\bar{E}_1) = n + 3$. Thus, we have $\rho(E_1) = n$.

3. Let's look at the divisor $(x = 0)$ on E_1 . It consists of n curves $l_1, \dots, l_n$.

Let's prove that on the $\bar{E}_1$ $(\bar{l}_i)^2 = -1$:

We have $(x = 0)|_{E_1} = l_1 + \cdots + l_n$. Self-intersection numbers of l_i are equal since the symmetry of l_i . We have

$$\frac{n}{n-1} = (x = 0)^2|_{E_1} = \left(\sum l_i\right)^2 = nl_i^2 + \sum_{i < j} 2l_i l_j = nl_i^2 + n$$

Therefore

$$l_i^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} - 1 = -\left(\frac{n-2}{n-1}\right)$$

and

$$\bar{l}_i^2 = l_i^2 - \frac{1}{n-1} = -1.$$

□

2.4. Weighted blow-ups of $xy + z^n + u^n = 0$.

Lemma 2.5. *There are no weighted blow-ups of $xy + z^n + u^n = 0$ producing an irreducible divisor with discrepancy $k \geq 2$ in Mori's category.*

Proof. Let's look at weighted blow-up of $h : Y \rightarrow X$ with weights (a, b, c, d) . With no loss of generality we will consider that $a + b = nc$. We will consider two cases:

1. $a + b = nc = nd$
2. $a + b = nc < nd$
1. Let's examine the terminality of Y . Indeed, Y is covered by four affine charts U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4

$$U_1 = \{\bar{y} + \bar{z}^n + \bar{u}^n = 0\}/\mathbb{Z}_a(1, -b, -c, -c),$$

$$U_2 = \{\bar{x} + \bar{z}^n + \bar{u}^n = 0\}/\mathbb{Z}_b(-a, 1, -c, -c),$$

$$U_3 = \{\bar{x}\bar{y} + \bar{u}^n + 1 = 0\}/\mathbb{Z}_c(-a, -b, 1, 0),$$

$$U_4 = \{\bar{x}\bar{y} + \bar{z}^n + 1 = 0\}/\mathbb{Z}_c(-a, -b, 0, 1).$$

Classification of terminal singularities (see [16]) tells us that singularities of Y in charts U_1 and U_2 are terminal if and only if

$$c \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$$

$$c \equiv 1 \pmod{b}.$$

Then, either $c = 1$ or $c > a$ and $c > b$. The latter is impossible since $a + b = nc$.

2. In this case we have $d > c$. Let's check the terminality of Y again.

It is covered by four affine charts U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4

$$U_1 = \{\bar{y} + \bar{z}^n + \bar{x}^{n(d-c)}\bar{u}^n = 0\}/\mathbb{Z}_a(1, -b, -c, -d),$$

$$U_2 = \{\bar{x} + \bar{z}^n + \bar{y}^{n(d-c)}\bar{u}^n = 0\}/\mathbb{Z}_b(-a, 1, -c, -d),$$

$$U_3 = \{\bar{x}\bar{y} + \bar{z}^{n(d-c)}\bar{u}^n + 1 = 0\}/\mathbb{Z}_c(-a, -b, 1, -d),$$

$$U_4 = \{\bar{x}\bar{y} + \bar{z}^n + \bar{u}^{n(d-c)} = 0\}/\mathbb{Z}_d(-a, -b, -c, 1).$$

Then, singularities in chart U_4 are terminal if $d > c$. $\square$

Here are some results from the paper [5].

Theorem 2.6. *Let X be a germ of a 3-dimensional terminal cA point defined by $xy + f(z, u) = 0$, n is a number of divisors with discrepancy 1 over X . Then, we have that $n = \deg_{\min}(f) - 1$, where $\deg_{\min}(f)$ is minimal degree among degrees of all the monoms in f .*

Moreover, it was showed in that paper that if we make the weighted blow-up of X with weights $(a, b, 1, 1)$ then the others divisors with discrepancy one lies precisely over non Gorenstein points of this weighted blow-up.

2.7. Examination of the cases.

2.7.1. *Cases 2(a) and 2(b).* Looking at the different models (among all the weighted blow-ups with weights $(a, b, 1, 1)$) we can reach the situation when the center of S lies in the singularity of the model. We obviously can consider only Y_1 and Y_{n-1} . It follows from [6], that S can be realized by some weighted blow-up $\bar{Y} \rightarrow X$. It is easy to notice that in this case $\bar{Y} \simeq Y$. Lemma 3.2 produces a contradiction with a terminality of Y .

2.7.2. *Cases 2(c) and 2(d).* It follows from the [5], that all terminal varieties which realize all the divisors with discrepancy 1 over X differs from one to other in flops in $\bar{l}_i$. The exact consequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{P^1}(-1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}_{X|l_i} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{P^1}(-1) \longrightarrow 0$$

allow us to blow-up $\bar{l}_i$ and then contract the surface to another ruling (see [11]). Therefore, we can consider the center of S on some model to be in the $x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + u^2 = 0$. It follows from [1] that in this case S realizes by the ordinary blow-up of this point. Hence, in our model S realizes as a blow-up of $\bar{l}_i$. Thus, the case 2(c) is not possible.

The case 2(d) we will consider on the weighted blow-up of X with weights $(1, n-1, 1, 1)$, E_1 is the exceptional divisor. It follows from [6] that a divisorial contraction to a curve passing through a terminal

cyclic quotient singularity is a weighted blow-up of this singularity. Therefore, we get a contradiction with lemma 2.5. $\square$

The main theorem of this section is proved.

3. Contractions to $xy + z^3 + u^4 = 0$

In this section we will prove the theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be a divisorial contraction from from terminal 3-fold Y to X - a germ of $xy + z^3 + u^4 = 0$ singularity, $\rho(Y/X) = 1$, divisor S is f -exceptional. Then f is isomorphic to the weighted blow-up of X with weights $(k, n - k, 1, 1)$ for $k = 1, 2$.*

We will use the same method and the same plan that used in the previous section.

1. The discrepancy of $a(S)$ (over X) is equal to 1. All those morphisms (in Mori's category) is classified in [5].
2. $a(S) = k \geq 2$.
 - (a) The center of S on E_1 is a point and it does not lie on any l_i .
 - (b) The center of S on E_1 is a curve and it does not coincide with any l_i .
 - (c) The center of S on E_1 is a point and it lies on some l_i .
 - (d) The center of S on E_1 is a curve and it coincides with some l_i .

We will prove our main theorem checking all the cases.

3.2. Geometry of E_1 .

Proposition 3.3. *For the surface E_1 the following statements are true:*

1. E_1 is a rational surface with two Du Val singularities of a type A_1, A_2 ;
2. the Picard number of E_1 is equal to 1;
3. there is just one (-1) -curve $\bar{l}$ on the minimal resolution of E_1 $\alpha : \bar{E}_1 \rightarrow E_1$ and l is passing through two singularities of E_1 .

Proof. 1. We have Y_1 covered by four affine charts U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4 :

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 &= \{\bar{y} + \bar{z}^3 + \bar{u}^4 = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^4, \\ U_2 &= \{\bar{x} + \bar{z}^3 + \bar{u}^4 = 0\} / \mathbb{Z}_2(-1, 1, -1, -1), \\ U_3 &= \{\bar{x}\bar{y} + 1 + \bar{u}^4 = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^4, \\ U_4 &= \{\bar{x}\bar{y} + \bar{z}^3 + \bar{u} = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^4. \end{aligned}$$

There is only one singularity on Y_1 of a $\frac{1}{2}(-1, 1, 1)$ type. It lies in the chart U_2 . In the chart U_4 there is a singularity of a type A_2 on E_1 .

2. We have $K_{E_1}^2 = \frac{(3-3+2)^2 3}{2} = 6$. The minimal resolution of E_1 is consist of 3 blow-ups. We have, $K_{\bar{E}_1}^2 = K_{E_1}^2 = 6$

It follows from the Noether formulae that $\chi(\bar{E}_1) = 4$. Therefore, $\rho(E_1) = 1$.

3. Actually, there is only one surface with such a properties up to an isomorphism. This is $\mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3)$. There is only one l such that on the minimal resolution $\bar{l}^2 = -1$ on it.

□

3.4. Weighted blow-ups of $xy + z^3 + u^4 = 0$.

Lemma 3.5. *There are no weighted blow-ups of $xy + z^3 + u^4 = 0$ producing an irreducible divisor with discrepancy $k \geq 2$ in Mori's category.*

Proof. Let's look at weighted blow-up of $h : Y \rightarrow X$ with weights (a, b, c, d) . We will consider the following three cases:

1. $a + b = 3c = 4d$;
 2. $a + b = 3c < 4d$;
 3. $a + b = 4d < 3c$.
1. Let's examine the terminality of Y . Indeed, Y is covered by four affine charts U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4

$$U_1 = \{\bar{y} + \bar{z}^3 + \bar{u}^4 = 0\} / \mathbb{Z}_a(1, -b, -c, -d),$$

$$U_2 = \{\bar{x} + \bar{z}^3 + \bar{u}^4 = 0\} / \mathbb{Z}_b(-a, 1, -c, -d),$$

$$U_3 = \{\bar{x}\bar{y} + \bar{u}^4 + 1 = 0\} / \mathbb{Z}_c(-a, -b, 1, -d),$$

$$U_4 = \{\bar{x}\bar{y} + \bar{z}^3 + 1 = 0\} / \mathbb{Z}_d(-a, -b, -c, 1).$$

Classification of terminal singularities (see [16]) tells us that singularities of Y in charts U_1 and U_2 are terminal if one of the cases are realized

- (a) $c+d \equiv 0 \pmod{a}$ and $c+d \equiv 0 \pmod{b}$. This case is impossible since there are $k, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $c+d = ak, c+d = bt$ which bring us to the contradiction: $b = \frac{12}{7} \left(k - \frac{7}{12}\right) a, k = \frac{7t}{12t-7} < 0$.
- (b) $c+d \equiv 0 \pmod{a}$ and $c \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$. This case is also impossible since there are $k, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $c+d = ak, c = bt+1$. We have either $t = 1$ which brings us to the contradiction with the condition $a + b = 3c = 4d$, or $t > 1$. Therefore, we have $3tb + 3 = 4ka - 4tb - 4$. Then, from the conditions $a = \frac{7tb+7}{4k}$ and $b(4k(3t-1) - 7t) = 7 - 12k$ we get $b < 0$ – contradiction.

- (c) $c \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$ and $c \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$. In this case we have either $c = 1$ which is impossible since $a + b = 3c = 4d$ or $3c > a + b$ which produce the contradiction again.
 - (d) $c \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$ and $d \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$. In this case we have got the contradiction with $a + b = 3c = 4d$.
2. Let's examine the terminality of Y . Indeed, Y is covered by four affine charts U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4

$$U_1 = \{\bar{y} + \bar{z}^3 + \bar{x}^{4d-a-b}\bar{u}^4 = 0\}/\mathbb{Z}_a(1, -b, -c, -d),$$

$$U_2 = \{\bar{x} + \bar{z}^3 + \bar{y}^{4d-a-b}\bar{u}^4 = 0\}/\mathbb{Z}_b(-a, 1, -c, -d),$$

$$U_3 = \{\bar{x}\bar{y} + \bar{z}^{4d-a-b}\bar{u}^4 + 1 = 0\}/\mathbb{Z}_c(-a, -b, 1, -d),$$

$$U_4 = \{\bar{x}\bar{y} + \bar{z}^3 + \bar{u}^{4d-a-b} = 0\}/\mathbb{Z}_d(-a, -b, -c, 1).$$

Classification of terminal singularities (see [16]) tells us that singularities of Y in chart U_4 are terminal if $4d - a - b = 1$ and singularities in charts U_1 and U_2 are terminal if one of the following cases are realized

- (a) $c + d \equiv 0 \pmod{a}$ and $c + d \equiv 0 \pmod{b}$. This case is impossible since there are $k, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $c + d = ak$ and $c + d = bt$. We have $d = \frac{3ka+1}{7}, \frac{4a}{t} = b = \frac{4ka-1}{7t}$. Then, we have got either $r < 0$ or $a < 0$ both lead us to the contradiction.
 - (b) $c + d \equiv 0 \pmod{a}$ and $c \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$. This case is also impossible since there are $k, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $c + d = ak, c = bt + 1$. We have either $t = 1$ which contradicts to $a + b = 3c = 4d$ or $t > 1$. Therefore, $a = \frac{7bt+8}{4k}$ and $b(4k(3t-1) - 7t) = 8 - 12k$ - the contradiction with positivity of b .
 - (c) $c + d \equiv 0 \pmod{a}$ and $d \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$. This case is impossible since there are $k, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $c + d = ak, c = bt + 1$. We have either $t = 1$ - the contradiction with $a + b = 3c = 4d$ or $t > 1$. Then, we have $a = \frac{7bt+6}{3k}$ and $b(3k(4t-1) - 7t) = 6 - 9k$ - the contradiction with positivity of b .
 - (d) $c \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$ and $c \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$. In this case we have got either $c = 1$ - the contradiction with $a + b = 3c = 4d$ or $3c > a + b$ - the contradiction again.
 - (e) $c \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$ and $d \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$. This case leads us to the contradiction with $a + b = 3c = 4d$.
3. The same calculations show us the impossibility of the last case. $\square$

3.6. Examination of the cases.

3.6.1. *Cases 2(a) and 2(b).* Looking at the different models we can reach the situation when the center of S lies in the singularity of the

model. It follows from [6], that S can be realized by some weighted blow-up $\bar{Y} \rightarrow X$. It is easy to notice that in this case $\bar{Y} \simeq Y$. Lemma 3.2 leads us to the contradiction with a terminality of Y .

3.6.2. *Cases 2(c) and 2(d).* If in the case 2(c) the center of S lies in the singularity A_2 on E_1 then S can be realized by a weighted blow-up of X . It follows from the toric structure of weighted blow-ups and from [8] since the singularity (on E_1) A_2 lies in the origine of the chart U_4 . If the center of S lies in another point then we can proceed in the same way as it was done in the previous section. The exact consequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{P^1}(-1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}_{X|\bar{l}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{P^1}(-1) \longrightarrow 0$$

allow us to blow-up $\bar{l}$ and then contract the surface to another ruling (see [11]). Therefore, we can consider the center of S on some model to be in the $x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + u^2 = 0$. It follows from [1] that in this case S realizes by the ordinary blow-up of this point. Hence, in our model S realizes as a blow-up of $\bar{l}$. Thus, the case 2(c) is not possible.

The case 2(d) we will consider on the weighted blow-up of X with weights $(1, 2, 1, 1)$, E_1 is the exceptional divisor. It follows from [6] that a divisorial contraction to a curve passing through a terminal cyclic quotient singularity is a weighted blow-up of this singularity. Therefore, we get a contradiction with lemma 2.5. $\square$

The main theorem of this section is proved

REFERENCES

- [1] Corti A. Singularities of linear systems and 3-fold birational geometry, Explicit Birational Geometry of 3-folds, A. Corti, M. Reid editors, L.M.S. lecture Note Series **281** (2000) 259–312
- [2] Corti A., Mella M. Birational geometry of terminal quartic 3-folds. I, preprint, math.AG/0102096, 2001
- [3] Cutkosky S. Elementary contractions of Gorenstein threefolds, Math. Ann., **280** (1988), 521–525
- [4] Danilov V.I. Birational geometry of toric 3-folds, Math.USSR Izv., **21** (1983), 269–280
- [5] Fedorov I.Yu. Blow-ups of three-dimensional terminal singularities: cA case, math.AG/0111307
- [6] Kawamata Y. Divisorial contractions to 3-dimensional terminal quotient singularities, Higher-dimensional complex varieties (Trento, 1994), de Gruyter, 1996, 241–246
- [7] Kawamata Y., Matsuda K., Matsuki K. Introduction to the minimal model program // Algebraic Geometry, Sendai. Adv. Stud. Pure Math. 1987. **10**. 283–360
- [8] Kawakita M. Divisorial contractions in dimension three which contract divisor to smooth points, preprint, math. AG/0005207
- [9] Kawakita M. Divisorial contractions in dimension three which contract divisors to compound A_1 points, preprint, math. AG/0010207

- [10] *Kawakita M.* General elements in anticanonical systems of threefolds with divisorial contractions and applications to classification, preprint, math.AG/0110050
 - [11] *Kulikov Vik. S.* Degenerations of K3 surfaces and Enriques surfaces, Math. USSR Izv. **11** (1977), 957-989
 - [12] *Luo T.* Divisorial contractions of threefolds: divisor to point, Amer. J. Math., **120** (1998), 441-451
 - [13] *Mori S.* On 3-dimensional terminal singularities, Nagoya Math. J., **98** (1985), 43-66
 - [14] *Mori S.* Threefolds whose canonical bundles are not numerically effective, Ann. of Math., **116** (1982), 133-176
 - [15] *Morrison D., Stevens G.* Terminal quotient singularities in dimension three and four, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **90** (1984), 15-20
 - [16] *Reid M.* Young person's guide to canonical singularities, Proc. Symp. in Pure Math. **46** (1987) 343-416
 - [17] *Reid M.* Minimal models of canonical threefolds, Adv. Stud. Pure Math. **1** (1983) 131-180
 - [18] *Shokurov V. V.* 3-folds log flips, Russian Acad. Sci. Izv. Math. **40**, (1993), 95-202.
- E-mail address:* ifedorov@mi.ras.ru

This figure "Fig1.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/math/0112011v1>